

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Hans Jacobsen Attorney Docket No: JACO0002  
Serial No: 10/620,243 Group Art Unit: 3663  
Filed: July 15, 2003 Examiner: Le, Hung Charlie  
Title: ARTICULATED BENDING BRAKE FOR SHEET METAL FORMING  
ELECTION IN RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Bellevue, Washington 98004

August 28, 2006

TO THE DIRECTOR OF THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE:

The following is in response to a Restriction Requirement dated June 27, 2006, in which the Examiner restricted the above-identified patent application. The Examiner has indicated that this application contains claims directed to two groups of patentably distinct inventions, including Group I (reciting a bending die for use in sheet metal forming), which includes Claims 1-36 and 47-52; and Group II (reciting a method for forming sheet metal), including Claims 39-44.

The Examiner further asserts that asserts that the claims encompass a plurality of different species, and has required applicant to elect a single species for prosecution on the merits, to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held allowable. The species include: Species A (the embodiment of FIGURES 4-6); Species B (the embodiment of FIGURES 7A-8C); Species C (the embodiment of FIGURES 9-13); Species D (the embodiment of FIGURES 14A-14B); Species E (the embodiment of FIGURE 15A); Species F (the embodiment of FIGURE 15B); Species G (the embodiment of FIGURE 15C); Species H (the embodiment of FIGURE 16); Species I (the embodiment of FIGURE 17A); Species J (the embodiment of FIGURE 17B); and Species K (the embodiment of FIGURE 17C).

In response to the restriction requirement, applicant affirmatively elects Group I (Claims 1-36 and 47-52) and Species A (the embodiment of FIGURES 4-6), with traverse. Claims 1-11, 13, 16, 25-30, 32, 34, 36, 47 and 52 are readable upon Species A.

1 Applicant respectfully traverses the species restriction for the following reasons.

2 The Examiner has indicated that Species E is the embodiment of FIGURE 15A, Species F is  
3 the embodiment of FIGURE 15B, and Species G is the embodiment of FIGURE 15C. However,  
4 FIGURES 15A-15C illustrate the same apparatus (thus each Figure should be encompassed by the  
5 same species; FIGURE 15A is different only because one end block 182 has been removed to enable  
6 additional detail to be viewed in the Figure as noted in the last paragraph on page 32, and  
7 FIGURE 15C is a cutaway view taken along a cross-sectional line to enable additional details of the  
8 apparatus to be more readily illustrated.) Thus, there is no species differentiation between Species E,  
9 F, and G.  
10

11 The Examiner has similarly indicated that Species I is the embodiment of FIGURE 17A,  
12 Species J is the embodiment of FIGURE 17B, and Species K is the embodiment of FIGURE 17C.  
13 However, FIGURES 17A-17C illustrate the same apparatus (thus each Figure should be encompassed  
14 by the same species; FIGURE 17B is different only because one end block 182 has been removed to  
15 enable additional detail to be viewed in the Figure, and FIGURE 17C is a side view). Thus, there is  
16 no species differentiation between Species I, J, and K.  
17

18 Finally, the Examiner has asserted that there are currently no generic claims. Applicant  
19 respectfully submits that independent Claims 1, 25, 42, and 50 are generic claims that encompass  
20 each different species. Furthermore, it is applicant's understanding that once a generic claim is  
21 allowed, independent Claims 48, 49, 51 and 52 (directed to one or more of the non-elected species)  
22 will be entitled to consideration.  
23

24  
25 Respectfully submitted,

26  
27 /mike king/  
28 Michael C. King  
29 Registration No. 44,832  
30

MCK/RMA:elm